



## OregonRTI District Implementation Evaluation Tool-School Based (DIET-SB)



School District:		School:			School Year: 2011-2012	
Completed by:						
RTI Components	0 - Creating Consensus	1 - Creating Infrastructure	2 - Initial Implementation	3 - Full Implementation	Item Score	
1. Leadership	Building administrator delegates primary RTI responsibilities to leadership team members	Building administrator attends RTI-related meetings when schedule allows (and takes no leadership role).	Building administrator attends <b>and</b> participates at RTI-related meetings when schedule allows.	Building administrator attends <b>and</b> participates in at least 90% of RTI-related meetings <b>Evidence: Meeting agendas and notes</b>		
2. Teaming	Building/RTI teams meet only to discuss students with intensive struggles (e.g. IEP, pre-referral teams, etc.)	Building/RTI teams meet to discuss students on an inconsistent basis	Building/RTI Teams meet regularly to discuss student data. Attendance by all members is not consistent <b>or</b> data is not consistently used to make decisions.	Building/RTI Teams meet regularly to discuss and make decisions using <b>student data</b> in a structured format with all required members in attendance. <b>Evidence: Action plans, student intervention plans</b>		
3. Research-Based Core (Tier 1)	No consistent reading block time across grade levels	School has 90-minute (or less) reading block* (interventions occur <b>WITHIN</b> the core) <b>*60 minute block for ½ day kindergarten</b>	School has a 90-minute reading block* (interventions occur <b>OUTSIDE</b> of the core)	School has a 90-minute reading block* (interventions occur <b>OUTSIDE</b> of the core) <b>AND</b> Common, agreed-upon grade-level instructional strategies. <b>Evidence: Schedule and fidelity/walkthrough tools</b>		
4. Research-Based Interventions (Tier 2 & 3)	Teachers are responsible for creating and/or providing interventions for their own students.	Interventions are provided to struggling students based on teacher referral/request.	Interventions are provided to struggling students based on <b>one</b> data source (e.g. CBM fluency scores)	Interventions are matched to the needs of struggling students based on <b>multiple</b> data sources. (e.g. CBM fluency and accuracy, phonics screeners, placement tests, etc.) <b>Evidence: Intervention plans, RTI meeting notes</b>		
5. Screening	Schoolwide Screening data are not currently collected 3 times per year for all students	Screening data are collected 3 times per year, but not used systematically	Screening data are used 3 times per year to evaluate the core program <b>OR</b> to identify at-risk students who receive interventions	Screening data are used 3 times per year to evaluate the core program <b>AND</b> to identify at-risk students who receive targeted instruction <b>Evidence: Assessment plan, Tier 1 meeting notes</b>		
6. Progress Monitoring	No systematic process in place for progress monitoring students	Progress monitoring system is in place but data is inconsistently collected.	Progress monitoring is collected <b>AND</b> graphed regularly. Data are not used consistently to make changes to student instruction.	District decision rules are consistently applied to progress monitoring data to make changes to student instruction <b>Evidence: Tier 2 meeting notes, student graphs</b>		
7. Professional Development	Instructional staff does not receive professional development linked to RTI and is not driven by schoolwide data	Instructional staff receives <b>inconsistent</b> professional development on RTI-related topics but not primarily driven by schoolwide data.	Instructional staff receives <b>ongoing</b> professional development on RTI-related topics (e.g. instruction, data-based decision making, etc), but not primarily driven by schoolwide data.	Staff professional development is primarily driven by schoolwide data indicating area of need & is linked to School Improvement Plan. <b>Evidence: Prof development plan/calendar, schoolwide student data indicating need</b>		
<b>*Total Score for Items 1-7</b>						
8. Coaching* Don't need to have someone with allocated FTE for coaching. May be teacher or other staff member serving as coach.	No one has been identified as a coach in your building	Building or district coach has been identified but their role is unclear	An identified coach provides support to teachers in your school, but that support is not structured or systematic	A coach works with teachers to provide in-classroom non-evaluative feedback to improve instructional practices at least once a month in your building		

\* - Coaching item score not included in total score

***To be completed by building leaders (principal, vice-principal, RTI coordinator, etc) and/or RTI building leadership team.***

**Directions:**

1. At the top, record your school district name, school name, current school year, and who is completing the form.
2. For RTI Components 1-7, read the accompanying descriptors for each score category (0 - Creating Consensus, 1 - Creating Infrastructure, 2 - Initial Implementation, 3 - Full Implementation) and provide an item score (0, 1, 2, or 3) in the right-hand column that **best describes** your school. ***Each descriptor serves as a general indicator of a school's level of implementation and is not meant to be a comprehensive evaluation of all systems a school may have in place.***
3. Add up the item scores for RTI components 1-7 and record overall score in the total box.
4. For ***Item 8: Coaching***, provide an item score (0, 1, 2, or 3) in the right hand column that **best describes** your school.
5. Return this form via email to your Oregon RTI contact person.